

The Quenched Approximation in Health and in Sickness *

Claude Bernard^a and Maarten Golterman

^aDepartment of Physics, Washington University
St. Louis, MO 63130-4899, USA

We present results for physical quantities computed in quenched chiral perturbation theory and compare them with the corresponding unquenched expressions. We also point out an apparent theoretical problem of the quenched approximation.

1. Introduction

We have recently proposed a systematic lagrangian approach to chiral perturbation theory (ChPT) for the quenched approximation of QCD [1,2]. This approach is based on the observation that QCD can be quenched by adding a number of scalar (ghost) quarks to the QCD lagrangian with exactly the same quantum numbers and masses as the physical, fermionic quarks, so that the combined determinants cancel exactly [3]. This defines a lagrangian formalism for QCD in the quenched approximation. The extended lagrangian possesses a graded $U(3|3)_L \otimes U(3|3)_R$ chiral symmetry.

One can then develop ChPT for this larger symmetry group in the usual way, assuming the existence of a Goldstone meson multiplet which corresponds to the breakdown of this group to its diagonal subgroup. This multiplet does not only contain the usual Goldstone mesons, but also fermionic mesons which are bound states of a physical quark and a ghost anti-quark or of a physical anti-quark and a ghost quark, and ghost mesons which are ghost quark anti-quark bound states. One has to take into account the graded nature of the symmetry group, by replacing traces and determinants by super-traces and super-determinants in the construction of the appropriate invariants.

In fact, the symmetry gets broken down to the semi-direct product group $[SU(3|3)_L \otimes SU(3|3)_R] \ltimes U(1)$ by the anomaly,¹ and corre-

spondingly there exists a “super- η' ”, Φ_0 , which is invariant under this reduced symmetry group. Φ_0 is a linear combination of the η' and its ghost partner, $\tilde{\eta}'$:

$$\Phi_0 = \text{str } \Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\eta' - \tilde{\eta}'),$$

where str denotes the super-trace and Φ is a graded hermitian 6×6 matrix describing the Goldstone meson multiplet (for details, see ref. [2]).

All these considerations lead to an $O(p^2)$ chiral lagrangian (in a notation similar to the notation used in ref. [4])

$$L = -V_0(\Phi_0) + V_1(\Phi_0)\text{str}(\partial_\mu \Sigma \partial^\mu \Sigma^\dagger) + V_2(\Phi_0)\text{str}(\mathcal{M}\Sigma + \mathcal{M}\Sigma^\dagger) + V_5(\Phi_0)(\partial_\mu \Phi_0)^2,$$

where the functions V_i can be chosen to be real and even, $\Sigma = \exp(2i\Phi/f)$, and

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} M & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix}, \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} m_u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_s \end{pmatrix},$$

where m_u , m_d and m_s are the quark masses.

The special role of the η' in the quenched approximation becomes clear from considering the quadratic part of L for the η' and $\tilde{\eta}'$ fields which (for degenerate quark masses) reads

$$L_{\text{quad}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \eta' & \tilde{\eta}' \end{pmatrix} \left[(p^2 - m_\pi^2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} - \mu^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \begin{pmatrix} \eta' \\ \tilde{\eta}' \end{pmatrix}.$$

*Presented by M. Golterman

¹The semi-direct product was incorrectly identified as a

direct product in refs. [1,2].

This leads to a propagator in the η - η' sector

$$\frac{1}{p^2 - m_\pi^2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{\mu^2}{(p^2 - m_\pi^2)^2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mu^2 = \frac{1}{2}V_0''(0)$ is the parameter which in the full theory gives the singlet part of the η' mass. (We have set $V_5 = 0$ for simplicity. One can show that vertices coming from V_5 contribute only at higher order in a combined expansion in $1/N_c$ and M to quantities considered in this talk.)

Because μ^2 appears in the numerator of eq. (1), it is clear that the η' does not decouple for large μ^2 in quenched ChPT, unlike the case of full QCD. This can also intuitively be understood from the “quark flow” approach. For a discussion and applications of the quark flow approach, see refs. [5–7,2].

2. Comparison between quenched and full ChPT

In full ChPT the ratio f_K/f_π at one loop for $m_u = m_d \equiv m$ is [4]

$$\left(\frac{f_K}{f_\pi}\right)_{\text{full}}^{1\text{-loop}} = 1 + \frac{5}{4}\mu_\pi - \frac{1}{2}\mu_K - \frac{3}{4}\mu_\eta + (m_s - m)\tilde{L}_{5,\text{full}},$$

where $\mu_P = \frac{1}{16\pi^2 f^2} m_P^2 \log \frac{m_P^2}{\Lambda^2}$ and $\tilde{L}_{5,\text{full}}$ is the coefficient of an $O(p^4)$ term. In quenched ChPT the result is [1,2]

$$\left(\frac{f_K}{f_\pi}\right)_{\text{qu}}^{1\text{-loop}} = 1 + \frac{\mu^2/3}{16\pi^2 f^2} \left[\frac{m_K^2}{2(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2)} \log \left(\frac{2m_K^2}{m_\pi^2} - 1 \right) - 1 \right] + (m_s - m)\tilde{L}_{5,\text{qu}}.$$

These two expressions can however not be compared directly, since in general the parameters in the full and quenched ChPT lagrangians will not be equal: $\tilde{L}_{5,\text{qu}} \neq \tilde{L}_{5,\text{full}}$. This implies that in order to compare full and quenched ChPT we will have to consider physical quantities independent of bare parameters. In the full theory, such a quantity is $f_\eta f_\pi^{\frac{1}{3}} f_K^{-\frac{4}{3}}$ [4]. However, in quenched ChPT with $m_s \neq m$, the η inherits the η' double pole (eq. (1)) through mixing.

A similar physical quantity can be defined in $N_f = 4$ QCD with quark masses $m_u = m_d \equiv m$ and $m_s = m_{s'} \equiv m'$. The quantity we wish to consider here is

$$R = \frac{f_K}{\sqrt{f_\pi f_{\pi'}}},$$

where π , K and π' denote the $\bar{d}u$, $\bar{s}u$ and $\bar{s}'s$ mesons, respectively. This quantity is natural to compute in a quenched simulation, since one has the quark propagators for various masses. The total number of flavors, N_f , is irrelevant, as only the valence quarks play a role in the calculation of any quenched quantity. In full ChPT,

$$R_{\text{full}} = 1 - \frac{1}{64\pi^2 f^2} \left[m_\pi^2 \log \frac{m_K^2}{m_\pi^2} + m_{\pi'}^2 \log \frac{m_K^2}{m_{\pi'}^2} \right], \quad (2)$$

whereas in quenched ChPT,

$$R_{\text{qu}} = 1 + \frac{\mu^2/3}{16\pi^2 f^2} \left[\frac{m_\pi^2 + m_{\pi'}^2}{2(m_{\pi'}^2 - m_\pi^2)} \log \frac{m_{\pi'}^2}{m_\pi^2} - 1 \right], \quad (3)$$

where we used the tree level relation $m_K^2 = \frac{1}{2}(m_\pi^2 + m_{\pi'}^2)$. Note that the logs in the full and quenched expression have completely different forms, stemming from their different physical origins.

To get a feeling for the numerical difference we have substituted two sets of numerical values for the quantities appearing on the right-hand side of eqs. (2,3). First, we have considered the “real” world, with $m_\pi = 140$ MeV and $m_K = 494$ MeV (with $m_{\pi'}$ computed from its tree level relation to m_π and m_K), and with $\mu^2/3 = (500 \text{ MeV})^2$ from the full QCD η' mass. Secondly, we have used the quark and meson masses from a typical simulation (ref. [8], $\beta = 6.2$), in particular $m = 0.007$, $m' = 0.03$ and $a^{-1} = 2.9$ GeV. (Again we took $\mu^2/3 = (500 \text{ MeV})^2$.) For the “real” world we get

$$R_{\text{full}} = 1.023, \quad R_{\text{qu}} = 1.066$$

(a difference of 4.2%), whereas for the $\beta = 6.2$ data we find

$$R_{\text{full}} = 1.022, \quad R_{\text{qu}} = 1.014$$

(a difference of 0.8%).

We have also looked at an $N_f = 3$ quantity independent of the bare parameters (using results from [2]), namely

$$\chi = \frac{\langle \bar{d}d \rangle}{\langle \bar{u}u \rangle} - \frac{m_{K^0}^2 - m_{K^+}^2}{m_{K^0}^2 - m_{\pi^+}^2} \frac{\langle \bar{s}s \rangle}{\langle \bar{u}u \rangle}.$$

(In QCD, the divergences of $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$ cancel in χ [4].) At tree level, the values for full and quenched ChPT coincide, but again, at one loop

$$\Delta\chi \equiv \chi^{1\text{-loop}} - \chi^{\text{tree}}$$

differs.

For the real world, we find

$$\chi^{\text{tree}} = 0.982$$

and

$$\Delta\chi_{\text{full}} = -0.002, \quad \Delta\chi_{\text{qu}} = -0.064$$

(the difference between χ_{full} and χ_{qu} is 6.3%). From the $\beta = 6.2$ data of ref. [8] with quark masses $m_u = 0.01$, $m_d = 0.02$ and $m_s = 0.03$ we obtain

$$\chi^{\text{tree}} = \frac{1}{2},$$

$$\Delta\chi_{\text{full}} = -0.017, \quad \Delta\chi_{\text{qu}} = -0.026$$

(a difference of 1.9% in χ).

The one-loop corrections for the full and quenched quantities are unrelated for both R and χ (for an example where they are the same, see ref. [6]). However, for both examples (R and χ), the difference between the full and quenched case is small. This is due simply to the fact that the one-loop corrections themselves are small. Note that the differences between the quenched and full case grow with decreasing quark mass, due to the fact that the quenched one-loop corrections grow with decreasing quark mass. We will return to this point in the next section. To our knowledge, the results presented in this section constitute the first controlled calculation of the difference between quantities in the quenched and full theories.

We have been using an estimate for μ^2 from the full theory, whereas of course its quenched value need not be equal to the full value. It would

therefore be nice if we could measure μ_{qu}^2 from quenched data. One could in principle determine μ_{qu}^2 from a fit of the pion mass to the form [2]

$$(m_\pi^2)_{\text{qu}}^{1\text{-loop}} = Am \left[1 - \frac{\mu^2/3}{8\pi^2 f^2} \log \frac{m}{m_0} + Bm \right].$$

We have tried to fit both the $\beta = 6.2$ and $\beta = 6.0$ data from ref. [8] (not only for m_π but also for $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$). However, we have not been able to uncover any chiral logs in these data; one apparently needs smaller errors and lower quark masses.

3. Problems with quenched QCD?

Let us again consider the quenched result for f_K/f_π (cf. sect. 2). Rewritten in terms of quark masses the result is

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{f_K}{f_\pi} \right)_{\text{qu}}^{1\text{-loop}} = & \\ & 1 + \frac{\mu^2/3}{16\pi^2 f^2} \left[\frac{m_u + m_s}{2(m_s - m_u)} \log \frac{m_s}{m_u} - 1 \right] \\ & + L - \text{term}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that the limit $m_u \rightarrow 0$ with m_s fixed, which is well defined in the full theory, does not exist here [1,2]. Stated in other words, taking both $m_u, m_s \rightarrow 0$, one is left with a result dependent on the ratio m_s/m_u . (A similar problem in $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ has been discussed in ref. [6]. See also ref. [7].) This seems to imply that *no chiral limit exists for quenched QCD!* We note here that the bare quark mass appearing in the chiral lagrangian is analytic in the bare quark mass which appears in the QCD lagrangian (in both the full and the quenched cases). This means that redefinitions of the quark mass [6] cannot solve the problem.

The problem arises from IR divergences due to the double pole term in the η' propagator (cf. eq. (1)). The first question one may therefore ask is whether this double pole term is really there, or whether it might be softened by summing the quenched perturbative expansion.

This can be phrased as follows (for simplicity we consider the case of degenerate quark masses). In the summed theory, the parameter μ_{qu}^2 appearing in eq. (1) will become momentum dependent.

(In the quenched theory we may take eq. (1) as a definition of $\mu_{\text{qu}}^2(p)$ to all orders. Similarly, in the full theory $\mu_{\text{full}}^2(p)$ is defined to all orders as the singlet part of the η' self-energy.) If now $\mu_{\text{qu}}^2(p) \rightarrow 0$ for $p \rightarrow 0$, the double pole would be softened, leading to a less divergent chiral limit. It appears however, that this will not occur:

We first observe that to leading order in $1/N_c$

$$\mu_{\text{qu}}^2(p) = \mu_{\text{full}}^2(p) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{N_c}\right) \right),$$

and secondly, that

$$\mu_{\text{full}}^2(p=0) \neq 0$$

in particular when the quark mass m is set to zero. The latter statement follows from the fact that the η' is a well-behaved meson in full QCD with a nonvanishing mass in the chiral limit. Assuming the validity of the $1/N_c$ expansion, we conclude that

$$\mu_{\text{qu}}^2(p=0) \neq 0,$$

which means that the double pole is a true feature of the quenched theory!

This argument does not prove that no resummation could ameliorate the problem. On this issue, however, we have the following remarks:

- Sharpe has summed a class of diagrams in the case of degenerate quark masses [6,7]; this did *not* lead to a less singular result.
- In the nondegenerate case there are many more relevant diagrams, and it is not clear that a systematic resummation can be carried out.
- Any resummation method would have to work for each quantity that does not have a chiral limit at one loop. Many such quantities exist. If some resummation works for each quantity, one would expect that there is a general explanation of *why* it works. We have shown above that this explanation cannot be a softening of the η' double pole term, which nevertheless seems to be the origin of the problem.

In view of these remarks, we believe that the nonexistence of a chiral limit is a real problem of the quenched theory, and not an artifact of chiral perturbation theory.

4. Conclusions

We have calculated in a controlled way the difference between the quenched and full versions of QCD for two physical quantities. Such calculations can be extended straightforwardly to many other physical quantities.

We have also pointed out that quenched QCD does not seem to have a well-behaved chiral limit, due to the peculiar role of the η' in the quenched approximation. We believe that this is a real problem of the quenched theory, and not an artifact of ChPT. In order for the quenched approximation to remain a key tool in lattice QCD, it will be essential to gain a better understanding of this problem.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Steve Sharpe for useful discussions. Part of this work was carried out at Los Alamos National Laboratory and UC Santa Barbara. M.G. would like to thank Rajan Gupta and the Theory Division of LANL, and both of us would like to thank the UCSB Physics Department, and in particular Bob Sugar, for hospitality. This work is supported in part by the Department of Energy under grant number DE-2FG02-91ER40628.

REFERENCES

1. C.W. Bernard and M.F.L. Golterman, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 26 (1992) 360.
2. C.W. Bernard and M.F.L. Golterman, Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 853.
3. A. Morel, J. Physique 48 (1987) 111.
4. J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. B250 (1985) 465.
5. S. Sharpe, Phys. Rev. D41 (1990) 3233; S. Sharpe, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 17 (1990) 146; G. Kilcup *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990) 25; S. Sharpe, DOE/ER/40614-5, to be published in *Standard Model, Hadron Phenomenology and Weak Decays on the Lattice*, ed. G. Martinelli, World Scientific.
6. S. Sharpe, Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 3146.
7. S. Sharpe, these proceedings.
8. R. Gupta *et al*, Phys. Rev. D43 (1991) 2003.